

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are amended. Claims 3, 8, 12, 13, 17, and 18 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 7 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added by these amendments. By amending and canceling the claims, applicants are not conceding that the claims are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 102, as the present claim amendments are only for the purpose of facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional applications. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-11, 14-16, and 19-20 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Gegner (WO 2003/104966 A3). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the Gegner because all of the elements of the claims are not taught or suggested by the Gegner for the reasons argued below.

Claim 1 recites: “selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects ...; copying the subset to a peek view; and replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects.” Since claim 1 recites that the subset is copied from the first plurality of data objects and the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects, once the first plurality of data objects have been replaced, the subset in the peek view is different from the second plurality of data objects in the main view.

In contrast, in Gegner, the left-hand side of Fig. 5 (which the Office Action relies on for a peek view) is identical to a portion of the right-hand side of Fig. 5 (which the Office Action relies on for a main view). Thus, the right-hand side of Fig. 5 was not replaced by different data objects, so Gegner does not teach or suggest “replacing the first

S/N 10/687,291
ROC920030263US1

plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects,” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action argues that “different data object groups are imported on the right-hand side of fig. 5 can be done by user selection,” but the Office Action does not cite any portion of Gegner in support of this argument.

Claim 1 further recites: “selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects based on a size of a peek view and based on a respective importance of each of the first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view; copying the subset to the peek view; displaying the peek view; and replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects.” Thus, in claim 1, the data objects that are displayed in the peek view are selected based on the size of the peek view and based on the importance of the objects, and the entire first plurality of data objects remain in the main view until all are replaced. Hence, data objects are not selectively suppressed; instead, data objects are selectively displayed in an additional (peek) view.

In contrast, Gegner suppresses the display of less important objects, as recited in Gegner at page 3, line 15. Hence, Gegner suppresses the display of objects based on importance while claim 1 displays objects in a peek view based on importance, so Gegner describes the opposite of claim 1, and thus Gegner teaches away from claim 1.

Independent claims 6, 11, and 16 include similar elements as argued above for claim 1 and are patentable over the references for similar reasons. Claims 2, 4-5, 9-10, 14-15, and 19-20 are dependent on claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, respectively, and are patentable for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims.

S/N 10/687,291
ROC920030263US1

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney (651-645-7135) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0465.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Branson, et al.

By their Representative,



Owen J. Gamon
Reg. No. 36,143
(651) 645-7135

Date: June 26, 2007

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents 571-273-8300, on June 26, 2007.

Owen J. Gamon
Name



Signature

S/N 10/687,291
ROC920030263US1